

### REMARKS

This Amendment is in response is to the Office Action dated February 8, 2007 and a telephone interview between the Examiner and the undersigned, David D. Brush. With this amendment, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims in view of the above-amendments and the following remarks.

#### I. TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

Applicants' Attorney would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during a telephone interview held on May 31, 2007. The interview focused on the objection to claim 12 and the rejection of claims 25 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

With respect to claim 20, Applicants' Attorney agreed to remove the extraneous parenthesis.

With respect to claim 25 and 40, Applicants' Attorney proposed to amend claims 25 and 40 to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 without incorporating the subject matter of dependent claims 26 and 41, respectively.

The Examiner agreed that an amendment could be made without the additional subject matter. While no agreement was reached as to particular wording, Applicants' Attorney agreed to submit a proposal by a formal Amendment for consideration. The above-amendments reflect one of the proposals that were discussed.

If any further amendments or different wording are necessary to overcome the §101 rejection, Applicants respectfully request a further telephone interview and an opportunity to make amendments by an Examiner's Amendment.

#### II. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER §101

Claims 25 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully disagree, but propose to amend claims 25 and 40 in an effort to overcome the rejection.

With these amendments, claims 25 and 40 clearly result in a physical transformation outside of a computer and/or are limited to a practical application within the

technological arts. Specifically, the token T and the responses Di are made available to at least one of a public or a verifying entity.

These amendments are unambiguously disclosed in an implicit manner in the specification, since for example, a signing operation to obtain a signed message (electronic or manual operation) includes making this signature available to the public or to a verifying entity.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the claim rejections under §101 be withdrawn.

III. CLAIMS 26 AND 32

In addition, the formulas appearing in claims 26 and 32 are amended to replace the sign “x” with the sign “.” in order to be consistent with the signs used in the formulas appearing in the other claims.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,  
WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /David D. Brush/  
David D. Brush, Reg. No. 34,557  
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319  
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

DDB/tkj